UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,948	03/30/2004	Peter E. Hart	20412-08341	8279

758 7590 05/16/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
POON, KING Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,948	HART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 February 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-67* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *31-49* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30 and 50-67* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/6/2007, 2/2/2007, 4/27/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 50, 51, 60, 61, 66, 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Perkins (US 6,106,457).

Regarding claim 50: Perkins teaches a method for printing time-based media (the hard copy of the time based video of fig. 43, column 35, lines 60-67, column 33, lines 35-40), the method comprising: receiving time-based media from an external source (column 33, lines 35-65); processing the time-based media to determine a printed representation of the time-based media and an electronic representation of the time-based media (column 35, lines 50-67), the processing performed at least in part within a printing system (PC 1012 of the system shown in fig. 35, fig. 35 excluding 732A is the printing system) and in part within a network device (732A, fig. 35, digital video processing engine, fig. 34) coupled to the printing system via a network, wherein the processing comprises recognizing content contained with the time based media (recognizing each digital image of interest, column 33, lines 10-20) and producing the printed representation based on the recognized content (column 50, lines 50-67); producing a printed output that corresponds to the printed representation of the time-

based media (column 35, lines 50-67); and producing an electronic output that corresponds to the electronic representation of the time-based media (e.g., stored in a server, column 34, lines 45-65).

Regarding claim 51: Perkins teaches wherein the time-based media are received via a single communication interface (796, fig. 35).

Regarding claim 60: Perkins teaches wherein the interface comprises an embedded video recorder (fig. 34), wherein the external source of media is a series of images captured by embedded the video recorder, converted into an electrical format, and then provided to the media processing system.

Regarding claim 61: Perkins teaches wherein the interface comprises an embedded audio recorder (column 33, lines 55-65, column 31, lines 5-20), wherein the external source of media is a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the embedded audio recorder and then provided to the media processing system.

Regarding claim 66: Perkins wherein the electronic output system is coupled to a speaker system and sends an audio signal to the speaker system (inherent properties of playing audio, column 35, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 67: Perkins teaches wherein producing the electronic output comprises generating a video signal for playback by a display system (fig. 43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730).

Regarding claim 1: Perkins teaches a system (e.g., fig. 35) for printing time-based media (time based captured video images, column 33, lines 35-40, column 35, lines 50-55, fig. 43), the system comprising: an interface (796, column 31, lines 5-20) for receiving time-based media from an external source (732 A, column 31, lines 5-10), a network (column 31, lines 55-67) including a printing system (the printing system that allows a hard copy to be made, column 35, lines 50-55) and a network device (PC 1012, column 35, lines 40-45), a media processing system (the software of the PC) coupled to the interface to receive the time-based media, the media processing system configured to recognized content contained within the time based media (recognized the image in a data file, column 35,lines 40-45) and determined a printed representation of the time-based media based on the recognized content (sending the right image to the printer, column 35, lines 50-55) and an electronic representation of the time-based media (the data to be transferred to other system such as a PC, column 34, lines 27-35) corresponding to the printed representation, wherein the media processing system resides at least in part on the network device (the system includes the software of the PC); a printed output system (the printer that prints the hard copy of column 35, lines

60-67) in communication with the media processing system to receive the printed representation, the printed output system producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the time-based media (reviewed and approved video images, column 35, lines 50-55); and an electronic output system (e.g., the computers of the central network, column 34, lines 35-50) in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output (the image that is being stored in the central network, fig. 35, column 34, lines 60-67) from the electronic representation of the time-based media.

Perkins does not teach the media processing system is at least in part on the printing system.

Ishii, in the same area of printing video images from a PC (column 1, lines 10-20), teaches in order for the printer receives with the PC, there must be a media processing device (video processing circuit, fig. 2, column 6, lines 55-60) in the printer for receiving the video images.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ishii to include: connecting the printer to the PC and providing a media processing device in the printer such that the printer is capable of receiving video images form the PC.

Note: the media processing device in the PC and the printer form the media processing system.

Regarding claim 2: Perkins teaches wherein the network device is a personal computer (1012, fig. 35).

Regarding claim 3: Perkins teaches wherein the network is a local area network (column 35, lines 45-46).

Regarding claim 4: Perkins teaches a remote external service system (fig. 34) coupled to the network, the external service system in communication with the media processing system for performing at least some processing steps for the time-based media.

Regarding claim 5: Perkin teaches wherein the external service system is coupled to Internet (column 35, lines 45-50).

Although Perkins does not disclosed the LAN is connected to the Internet; it is well known in the art to connected LAN to Internet such that the system on the LAN would be able to communicate with other networks world-wide (official notice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have connect the LAN onto Internet such that Perkins system would be able to communicate with other systems world-wide.

Regarding claim 6: Perkins teaches wherein the interface comprises a single communication interface allowing the system to be communicatively coupled to an electronic device, the electronic device providing the time-based media to the system (fig. 35).

Regarding claims 9, 10: Perkins does not teach wherein the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast.

However, Perkins in other embodiment, realized that it is an advantage to use radio signal for data transmitting (column 37, lines 40-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Perkins's system to include: wherein the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast.

The reason of doing so would have provided convenient for the user without having to be restricted by wires.

Note: media broadcaster and a receiver tunes to the broadcast frequency is inherent in radio communications.

Regarding claim 14: Perkins teaches wherein the interface comprises an embedded video recorder (fig. 34), wherein the external source of media is a series of images captured by embedded the video recorder, converted into an electrical format, and then provided to the media processing system.

Regarding claim 15: Perkins teaches wherein the interface comprises an embedded audio recorder (column 33, lines 55-65, column 31, lines 5-20), wherein the external source of media is a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the embedded audio recorder and then provided to the media processing system.

Regarding claim 21: Perkins wherein the electronic output system is coupled to a speaker system and sends an audio signal to the speaker system (inherent properties of playing audio, column 35, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 22: Perkins teaches wherein the electronic output system comprises an embedded sound player for generating the audio signal (inherent properties of playing audio, column 35, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 23: Perkins teaches the PC is used on Internet (column 35, lines 45-50). It is well known in the art that a PC on Internet comprises an embedded web page display (official notice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Perkins to include: an embedded web page display such that the PC can be used on Internet.

Regarding claim 24: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded multimedia server (at least a display and video, column 33, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 25: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio encryption module (column 34, lines 49-60).

Regarding claim 26: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded video encryption module (column 34, lines 49-60).

Regarding claim 27: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio sound localization module (column 35, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 28: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded video motion detection module (column 34, lines 1-20)

Regarding claim 29: Perkins teaches, wherein the network device includes a user interface that provides information to a user about at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the time-based media, the user interface further accepting input from a user to cause the media processing system to modify at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the time-based media (column 35, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 30: Perkins teaches wherein the media processing system determines at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation with assistance from an external computing device column 35, lines 33-38).

5. Claims 55, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 6,106,457).

Regarding claims 55, 56: Perkins does not teach wherein the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast.

However, Perkins in other embodiment, realized that it is an advantage to use radio signal for data transmitting (column 37, lines 40-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Perkins's system to include: wherein

the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast.

The reason of doing so would have provided convenient for the user without having to be restricted by wires.

Note: media broadcaster and a receiver tunes to the broadcast frequency is inherent in radio communications.

6. Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Seaman et al (US 5,682,33).

Regarding claims 7, 8: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises a media input device is a CD reader.

Seaman, in the same area of providing PC with video images (column 3, lines 2-20), teaches it is well known in the art since at least 1993 that the video data supplied to a PC would come from reading a CD in CD drive/interface (column 2, lines 20-30, column 3, lines 2-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises a media input device is a CD reader.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Seaman because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) using

a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Petitto et al. (US 5,774,260).

Regarding claim 11: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises an embedded device selected from a group consisting of: an embedded heat sensor, an embedded humidity sensor, an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, and an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor.

Petitto, in the same area of printing users of video images, teaches video images include images sensed by heat sensors (column 5, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises embedded heat sensor.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Petitto because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system as taught by Petitto in column 4, lines 60-67, column 5, lines 1-10.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Conway (US 5,444,476)

Regarding claim 12: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware.

Conway, in the same area of providing users with video images, teaches it is well known in the art to provide a screen capture hardware for generating video images (column 2, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Conway because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) using a well known method of obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Hon (US 4,907,973).

Regarding claim 13: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Hon, in the same area of providing users with video images, teaches it is well known in the art to provide a ultrasonic pen capture device for generating the video image frames to be view on a computer (fig. 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises ultrasonic pen capture device.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Hon because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method; and (c) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system.

10. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Cundiff, Sr. (US 6,466,534).

Regarding claims 16 and 17: Perkins does not teach wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device and wherein the removable storage device is selected from a group

consisting of: a DVD, a video cassette tape, a CD, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a computer disk, an SD disk, and a computer-readable medium.

Cundiff, in the same area of storing video images, teaches it is well known in the art to store video images in a CD (column 1, lines 25-45)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device and wherein the removable storage device is a CD.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Cundiff because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to store the video data; (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method; and (c) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system.

11. Claims 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) Cundiff, Sr. (US 6,466,534) and Fujita et al (US 5,903,538).

Regarding claims 18, 19: Perkins as modified by Cundiff teaches storing the video from the PC to a CD, see discussion of claims 16 and 17

Perkins does not teach output system comprises a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray.

Fujita, in the same area of storing video images, teaches it is well known in the art to store video images in a CD (column 1, lines 25-45) at a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray (fig. 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Fujita because it would have made the management and operation of high volume data possible as taught by Fujita at column 1, lines 20-25.

12. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view of Ishii et al (US 5,093,730) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Howald (US 6,153,667).

Regarding claim 20: Perkins does not teach wherein the electronic output system comprises a media writer selected from a group consisting of: a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer.

Howald, in the same area of printing, teaches it is well known in the art to print with a media writer wherein the electronic output system is a disposable media writer (column 4,lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the electronic output system comprises a media writer selected from a group consisting of: a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Hon because: (a) using a well known method printing is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method printing that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method.

13. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) in view as applied to claims 50 and further in view of Petitto et al. (US 5,774,260).

Regarding claim 57: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises an embedded device selected from a group consisting of: an embedded heat sensor, an embedded humidity sensor, an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, and an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor.

Petitto, in the same area of printing users of video images, teaches video images include images sensed by heat sensors (column 5, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises embedded heat sensor.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Petitto because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system as taught by Petitto in column 4, lines 60-67, column 5, lines 1-10.

14. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) as applied to claim 50 and further in view of Conway (US 5,444,476)

Regarding claim 58: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware.

Conway, in the same area of providing users with video images, teaches it is well known in the art to provide a screen capture hardware for generating video images (column 2, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Conway because:

(a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) using a well known method of obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method.

15. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) as applied to claim 50 and further in view of Hon (US 4,907,973).

Regarding claim 59: Perkins does not teach wherein the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Hon, in the same area of providing users with video images, teaches it is well known in the art to provide a ultrasonic pen capture device for generating the video image frames to be view on a computer (fig. 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the interface comprises ultrasonic pen capture device.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Hon because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method; and (c) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system.

16. Claims 62, 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) as applied to claim 50 and further in view of Cundiff, Sr. (US 6,466,534).

Regarding claim 62, 63: Perkins does not teach wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device and wherein the removable storage device is selected from a group consisting of: a DVD, a video cassette tape, a CD, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a computer disk, an SD disk, and a computer-readable medium.

Cundiff, in the same area of storing video images, teaches it is well known in the art to store video images in a CD (column 1, lines 25-45)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device and wherein the removable storage device is a CD.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Cundiff because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to store the video data; (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method; and (c) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system.

17. Claims 52, 53, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) as applied to claim 50 and further in view of Cundiff, Sr. (US 6,466,534).

Regarding claims 52, 53, 54: Perkins does not teach wherein the video data and audio data (column 33, lines 35-65) are received from a DVD reader/CD reader.

Cundiff, in the same area of storing video images, teaches it is well known in the art to store and receive audio and video images from a DVD reader (column 1, lines 25-45) to a PC.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the video data and audio data (column 33, lines 35-65) are received from a DVD reader/CD reader.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Cundiff because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method; and (c) it would have provided more usage for Perkins system.

18. Claims 64, 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 6,106,457) as applied to claim 50 and further in view of Howald (US 6,153,667).

Regarding claims 64, 65: Perkins does not teach wherein the electronic output system comprises a media writer which is a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer.

Howald, in the same area of printing, teaches it is well known in the art to print with a media writer wherein the electronic output system is a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer (column 4,lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins to include: wherein the electronic output system comprises a media writer which is a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Hon because: (a) using a well known method printing is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method printing that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 2/24/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that the printer of Ishii only perform processing such as decoding, transcoding, scaling which are different from the claimed media processing because the claimed media processing is performed on the content of the time-based media; the processing as claimed uses content recognition on the time based media to produce the printed representation based on the recognized content; has been considered.

In reply: The examiner has not found the limitation in the claims that would indicate the processing part of the print system that would perform any processing other than decoding, transcoding, scaling etc. The claims is not clear of what kind of processing is being carried out in particular, by the print system. The claim is claiming wherein the media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device.

In other words, the claim could be interpreted as the process that involves content recognition on the time based media is resided in the network device (see column 34, lines 1-20, column 33, lines 14-17, Perkins, the system would be able to recognized the image of interest and processed the image, also see column 36, lines 1-6) and the decoding, transcoding, and scaling are resided at least in part on the printing system such as the printer of Ishii.

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 12, 2007

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER